

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please substitute the attached drawing replacement sheet of 1 page, with Fig. 4, for the drawing presently on file. In Fig. 4, the reference numeral for the box at the bottom left has been changed from “3” to --6--.

(Attachment: The replacement sheet for Fig. 4 is at the back of this paper.)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

The specification is amended to correct several typographical errors and to make it consistent with the drawings and claims. Marked-up and clean substitute copies of the specification are submitted herewith. No new matter is added.

A replacement sheet of Fig. 4 is submitted herewith.

Claims 1-33 are in the application.

All claims are amended to conform to United States' practice, for example, by removing parenthetical references. Claims 1 and 22 are amended to clarify the subject matter of the invention. Claims 1, 3, and 22 are amended to correct grammatical errors. No new matter is added.

I. Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §112

The rejection of claims 1 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is traversed.

The phrase “a trajectory” in p. 32, line 10 and p. 32, line 20 refers to two separate trajectories. The two trajectories are delineated by the descriptive phrases following “a trajectory.” The trajectory on p. 32, line 10 is “inclined in relation to the rotation of the earth,” while the trajectory on p. 32, line 20 “cover[s] the distance between the space platform and the fixed base.” It is clear from the language of the claim that the two trajectories are not equivalent. Similarly, the two instances of “a trajectory” in claim 22 p. 37, lines 2-3 and p. 32, lines 12-13 are followed by the identical descriptive phrases and are definite for the same reasons.

In claim 1 as amended, the phrase “a transmitter , installed in at least one of the fixed bases in order to emit pulses in a determined frequency, each pulse in a predetermined reference instant” is acceptable. Claim 1 as amended makes it clear that the transmitter is installed in at least one of the fixed bases. In addition, claim 22 as amended contains similar language and is definite for the same reasons.

In claim 1 as amended, the phrase “a receiver for each of the fixed bases, each receiver being installed in one of the fixed bases in order to receive said pulses in a trajectory covering the distance between the space platform and the fixed base associated with the receiver” is acceptable. Claim 1 as amended claims a receiver at each of the fixed bases. In addition, claim 22 as amended contains similar language and is definite for the same reasons.

The phrase “receive said pulses in a trajectory” in claim 1, p. 32 lines 18-23 and claim 22, p. 37, lines 10-15 sufficiently claims the subject matter of the patent. It is clear from the language of the claims that the pulses are in a trajectory and not the receivers. As such, the claims distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In addition, claim 22 contains similar language and is also definite for the aforementioned reasons.

Applicant notes that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are now addressed. Applicant thanks the Examiner for noting the discrepancy. Applicant also notes that the arguments below are identical to the arguments made in the May 27, 2008 amendment.

II. Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §102

The rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 14-17, 22, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Chang *et al.*, (US 6,313,790) is traversed.

Applicants disclose the structure of three fixed bases where at least one fixed base has a transmitter, a receiver and a clock. When more than one base has a clock, the clocks are synchronized with each other. The transmitter emits pulses in a determined frequency, at a

predetermined reference instant and containing information of the instant of emission. Each pulse from each fixed base is transmitted to all the fixed bases through a communication device located in the space platform.

Applicants recite, in claim 1 as amended, the structure of:

A geographic and space positioning system ... [of] ...a first, a second, and a third base ... which are fixed ... and each having a previously known location;

a space platform ...;

a transmitter installed in at least one of the fixed bases in order to emit pulses in a determined frequency, each pulse in a predetermined reference instant;

a receiver for each of the fixed bases, each receiver being installed in one of the fixed bases in order to receive said pulses in a trajectory covering the distance between the space platform and the fixed base associated with the receiver; and

a control unit which is operatively connected to both the transmitter and the receiver, in order to calculate, for each pulse emission instant, the lateral edges of a tetrahedron, whose vertices are defined by the three fixed bases and by the space platform, based upon the determination of the propagation time of each pulse, in said trajectory, between the space platform and each fixed base in order to allow determining a respective extension of the trajectory of the space platform...

In Chang, the base stations are movable, they are not fixed. *See* column 3, lines 14-18 where Chang states that the secondary station may be any device that includes a transceiver such as automobiles mobile telephones, aircraft or the like as long as they are stationary during operation. Thus, in Chang, the stations are movable and have a location which is known, the stations are not fixed. The Examiner refers to column 12, lines 21-23 of Chang as saying that the bases are fixed in relation to the earth. What Chang discloses is that for nodes fixed to the surface of the Earth, W is

Clearly, Applicants disclose a device which operates differently than the device of Chang with structure which is positively recited in claim 1 which is not disclosed or suggested by Chang. Therefore, it is understood that claim 1 avoids Chang and is in condition for allowance. Claims 3-6, 14-17 depend from claim 1 and, therefore, are also in condition for allowance. For the reasons noted above, claim 22 and claim 33 which depends from claim 22 recite limiting features which avoid the Cheng reference.

where it identifies the space platform as "... visible from the fixed based and which moves to successive positions, as a function of time, according to a trajectory that is inclined in relation to the rotation axis of the earth..." Clearly, the satellite that Applicants track is in motion relative to the surface of the earth. In Knight, the satellite is stationary, it is in a fixed position relative to the surface of the earth. *See* column 1, lines 43-50, where Knight states that "Usually, these satellites are placed in geostationary orbits; that is, their orbits are chosen so they have a nearly constant apparent position relative to a user on Earth." (underscoring added for emphasis).

Thus, Knight's satellite does not move to successive positions, as a function of time as is recited in claim 1. Additionally, during tracking, the transmitter transmits a tracking signal which is received by the satellite and retransmitted back down to the receiver where the time delay and Doppler shift of the tracking signal is determined. *See* column 3, lines 33-36. Thus, by stating that a Doppler shift is obtained, it is Applicants' understanding that Knight is transmitting a signal of some duration. He is not transmitting only a pulse. Furthermore, Knight does not disclose or suggest the structure of a control unit as is positively recited in the last paragraph of claim 1.

The solutions by Knight and Chang are addressed to satellite position determination, using the principle of range measurement combined to range rate determination, the latter usually inferred from the carrier Doppler frequency drift. This is clarified in the respective texts of the two patents. In Knight and Chang, for determining the position and speed of the satellite, it is necessary to know the position variation and the time variation, which is obtained with the Doppler effect. The use of this principle is known since the very beginning of space exploration. The final satellite position determination requires a certain time interval to define the Doppler shifts association to the different range measurements - which cannot be obtained with a single measurement, at a given instant. The differences presented by Knight and Chang refer to the number of ground bases, their physical arrangements and differences in the processes of range and combined range rate measurements.

The present solution determines the repeater position on board a satellite (or in any other elevated platform, moving or fixed, visible by the reference bases) in a single instant, univocally, with the transmission of just one time signal from one of the bases, retransmitted by the repeater, received and compared at the three reference bases. The determination is immediate, does not require additional range measurements, and does not require a measurement of range rates. Clearly, the principles of operation of Applicants' invention and that of Knight and Chang are entirely different and, therefore, cannot be compared. Knight and Chang are based on combined range and range rate measurements. Applicants' invention is based on a single "snapshot" of temporal interaction.

Clearly, for the reasons noted above, claim 1 avoids the Knight reference and is in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 4-5, 7-8, 14-18, and 21 depend from claim 1 and are also considered to be in condition for allowance. For the reasons noted above, claim 22 recites limiting features similar to those of claim 1 which avoid the Knight reference. Claims 23, 28, and 30-31 depend from claim 22 and, therefore, are also in condition for allowance.

IV. Allowable Subject Matter

The allowance of claims 9-13, 19-20, 24-27 and 32 if amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as set forth in the Office Action, and if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims is noted with appreciation.

In view of the foregoing, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: August 7, 2008

By *Louis J. DelJuidice*
Louis J. DelJuidice
Registration No.: 47,522
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant